

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

XRAMP TECHNOLOGIES, INC. and
XRAMP SECURITY SERVICES, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

GEOTRUST, INC. and
CHRISTOPHER BAILEY,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 05-11374-RCL

GEOTRUST, INC.,

Counterclaim Plaintiff,

v.

XRAMP TECHNOLOGIES, INC. and
XRAMP SECURITY SERVICES, INC.

Counterclaim Defendants.

JOINT LOCAL RULE 16.1 STATEMENT

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 16 and Local Rule 16.1, GeoTrust Inc. ("GeoTrust") and Christopher Bailey ("Mr. Bailey") (collectively, the "GeoTrust Parties") and XRamp Technologies Inc. and XRamp Security Services, Inc. (collectively, "XRamp") submit the following statement.

I. PARTIES' STATEMENT OF THEIR POSITIONS

A. XRamp's Position

As set forth in its complaint XRamp alleges that the defendants GeoTrust, Inc. and its Senior Vice President of Business Development, Christopher Bailey, created and published a

web site called sslreview.com which purported to be an independent source of unbiased reviews of SSL certificate providers when in fact it provided false and misleading information regarding competitors including XRamp. As a result, XRamp suffered loss of business reputation which caused it to lose sales of its products and services, losses from which it has not recovered and are believed to be permanent.

B. GeoTrust Parties' Position

The GeoTrust Parties' position is that any statement contained on sslreview.com was truthful, was not misleading, and did not cause customer confusion, let alone a loss of sales to XRamp. Moreover, contrary to the allegations by XRamp, statements on the sslreview.com website identified GeoTrust as the sponsor of the site. Indeed, XRamp specifically requested that GeoTrust include a description of XRamp's product and services on sslreview.com.

With respect to its counterclaims, GeoTrust expects that the evidence will demonstrate that XRamp sent unsolicited, false and misleading email to GeoTrust customers, in which XRamp invited GeoTrust customers to "renew" their SSL certificates, without disclosing that the "renewed" certificates would be provided by XRamp and not GeoTrust. Those emails were false, deceptive and misleading, and caused customer confusion and actual money damages to GeoTrust.

II. PROPOSED SCHEDULE FOR DISCOVERY AND DISPOSITIVE MOTIONS

The parties agree that the following pre-trial schedule should permit sufficient time for the completion of discovery and the filing of dispositive motions.

- A. Rule 26(a) Initial Disclosures – November 23, 2005
- B. Fact Discovery Concluded – May 31, 2006

C. Expert Reports Due from both parties in support of the Complaint and Counterclaim – June 30, 2006

D. Expert Reports Due From both Parties with respect to defenses to the Complaint and Counterclaim – July 31, 2006

E. Expert Discovery Completed – September 30, 2006

F. Rule 56 Motions Filed – November 1, 2006

The parties expect to complete discovery within the limits on discovery events as set out in Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b).

III. CERTIFICATIONS

Counsel for each party hereby certifies that they have conferred with their clients (a) with a view toward establishing a budget for conducting the full course – and various alternative courses – for litigation, and (b) to consider the resolution of the litigation through the use of alternative dispute resolution.

XRAMP TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
and XRAMP SECURITY SERVICES, INC.

By their attorneys,

/s/ John W. Brister

John W. Brister (BBO 057420)
Leonard F. Zandrow (BBO 539030)
BRISTER & ZANDROW, LLP
268 Summer St.
Boston, MA 02210-1108
(617) 292-4900
(617) 292-4910 (fax)

GEOTRUST, INC. and
CHRISTOPHER BAILEY

By their attorneys,

/s/ Daniel Tighe

Daniel P. Tighe (BBO# 556583)
Griesinger, Tighe & Maffei, LLP
176 Federal St.
Boston, MA 02110
(617) 542-9900
(617) 542-0900 (fax)

Date: November 3, 2005